

RS 1 Librarians' Advocate

Number 3 October 1972

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL American Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO

LAUC and the AFT

Staff participation in decision making at UC through the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC) has never been fully implemented. In fact, evidence supports the view that LAUC is playing a less meaningful role than it did previously. Under the external pressures of politicians, tight budgets and an academic recession, the UC administration has been making fundamental library and personnel policy changes without timely, effective and broadbased participation by librarians. The examples are glaring and they multiply.

WHAT IS HAPPENING

In June, 1972, the University Administration imposed Section 82 of the Administrative Manual, covering procedures for appointments and promotions in the librarian series. Among the shortcomings in the administrative version of this section were a total lack of provision for tenure, no change in the unfair grievance procedure (modified only latter, due to an extended strike on the Berkeley campus), secret review committees with secret reports, and unrealistic criteria for promotion without such provisions for meeting these criteria as a shortened academic work year or a thirty-five hour work week.

The administration claimed that it was taking LAUC's views into consideration in formulating its proposal. It was apparent to the majority of UC librarians, however, that the University did not seriously listen to LAUC's proposals. The University held pro-forma meetings with LAUC leaders, at which it apparently listened to nothing. Even a petition signed by 83% of UC's librarians -- 498 out of an estimated 600 statewide -- stating that they found Section 82 unacceptable as written, did not deter the University administration from implementing it as planned. In San Francisco, the LAUC Division asked for an appointment with the Chancellor to present its reaction to the final version of Section 82. Its letter received no response.

Continued on page 8

THE AFT, UC,

6 LIBRARIANS' SALARIES

UC librarians have received a salary adjustment amounting to approximately 10%, retroactive to 1 July 1972. This includes a 9% general increase, plus a 1% inequity adjustment. Although a 10% raise is welcome after three lean years -- librarians got their last adjustment in July 1969 -- it is insufficient to bring librarians' salaries up to an acceptable level. Just to keep up with the rise in the cost of living, librarians would have needed an increase in the range of 15%. Indeed, economist Sylvia Porter noted (S.F. Chronicle, August 22, 1972) that from January 1969 to mid-1972 the cost of living went up 17.2%.

Librarians, with their total 10% increase, did better than most classes of academic employees, but not nearly so well as others, like Supervisors and Associate Supervisors in Physical Education (9 month appointees), who received increases of from 12.5% to 16.3% and whose salary range is now \$12,900 to \$20,600 (University of California Academic Salary Scales, July 1, 1972, p.10). The librarians' slight gain is obviously related to their participation in the recent ten-week work stoppage. At its close, the University signed a legally binding contract, in which it was stated that librarians and teaching assistants were grossly underpaid, and that a special inequity adjustment of up to 12% would be considered for them. The contract further stated that the University's proposal for salaries was to be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Central Labor Council of Alameda County. The AFT and the University were then to negotiate this proposal before a final decision was made.

The University did not forward its proposal to the Central Labor Council. It did not meet and confer with any union organization or with LAUC. Instead, it unilaterally announced a 1% salary inequity adjustment at

Continued on page 2

On August 25th meeting with the union's attorney, Victor J. Van Bourg. It thereby violated the contract it had signed and agreed to uphold. Apparently, University administrators feel no obligation to observe the agreements they sign, even if they run the risk of legal action to make them keep their word.

University representatives have never been at a loss for excuses. At a meeting on September 14 with AFT Berkeley librarians, they claimed they had been unable to present their minuscule proposal because of the pressure of time; it had been drawn up only after the Pay Board had approved the general 9% salary increase. The union thought it unlikely that administration did not have several contingency plans under consideration well before Pay Board action, and pointed out that the AFT had been requesting a meeting on this matter since mid-July.

How, asked AFT, had the University determined the amount of inequity adjustment for each class? The response was that it had been determined by comparison with the eight institutions with which UC most frequently exchanges faculty. Professors at UC were 13.3% behind in their salaries; therefore, all other academic employees must be considered similarly underpaid.

The AFT representatives took sharp issue with this, stating that the eight comparison institutions, like UC, paid sexually discriminatory wages to their librarians, and were equally in conflict with civil rights legislation, which requires that women not be paid less than men for equivalent work requiring equivalent academic preparation and experience. The correct comparison, AFT maintains, is with community colleges in California, or with Federal civil service schedules, where salaries and benefits for librarians range up to 60% above UC's because employees are not paid on a sexually discriminatory basis but instead receive the same salaries as their male-typed colleagues. Community college librarians enjoy a nine month work year, a 37 1/2 hour work week, have two weeks vacation at Christmas and one week at Easter, plus other holidays and a fully paid health plan. AFT thinks it is absurd to compare librarians at UC with faculty members at Harvard or Yale. Librarians must be compared with librarians -- at those institutions which do not pay sexually discriminatory wages! The AFT is prepared to carry this matter to the point of invoking the outside arbitration option which is provided for in the strike settlement between the Berkeley librarians' local and UC top management.

The AFT is seeking answers to three specific questions: Precisely how was the money available for inequity adjustments divided among academic classifications? What were UC's figures on the amount of inequity suffered by each category of academic employee? What did UC plan to do about the grossly inadequate, indeed, possibly unlawful, salaries it pays librarians?

In addition to representatives from the AFT and the University administration, Theodore Gould, statewide LAUC President, had also attended the September 14 meeting as a sympathetic observer. (LAUC has not officially endorsed the AFT's position on salaries, but is deeply concerned about the University's actions in this regard. LAUC has, however, authorized Mr. Gould to continue to sit in as an observer at AFT - administration negotiations.)

At approximately 9 am the next morning, Vice President for Academic Affairs Angus E. Taylor telephoned Mr. Gould to express his surprise that he had attended the meeting of the previous day. Mr. Taylor had a remarkable suggestion to make, later that day embodied in a formal letter: that Mr. Gould supply him with the names of six LAUC members, from whom 3 would be chosen to sit on a sub-committee of the Library Council, along with three University representatives. Their function: to study librarians' salary problems. "... While we are indebted to Mrs. Tallman's (statewide LAUC ad hoc salary) committee for the extensive study already made, it would seem advisable to avail ourselves of all possible additional data ..."

LAUC put the question of its participating in this committee before its members. In Berkeley there was a secret mail ballot; on other campuses there may have been merely voice votes of members present at hastily assembled meetings. Here are the announced results:

	For Participation	Against Participation
Berkeley	55	54
Davis	40	0
Irvine	5	19
Los Angeles	57	0
Riverside	11	1
San Diego	33	5
San Francisco	0	15
Sta. Barbara	25	18
Sta. Cruz	13	2
TOTAL	239	114

These figures pose some interesting questions. Why did 70% of LAUC members vote at Berkeley, but only 30% in equally-large Los Angeles? Why the unanimous or near-unanimous vote in favor of the proposal on a majority of campuses, while the vote in opposition was nearly 50% in Berkeley, 75% in Irvine, and 100% in San Francisco?

The answers are not hard to find. On the Berkeley campus the issues involved were brought clearly before LAUC members through the hasty printing and distribution of a leaflet which pointed out the dangers implicit in a deceptively attractive administration offer:

The timing of Mr. Taylor's offer to LAUC is highly suspicious. It came only after Mr. Gould had appeared with AFT members at a negotiating meeting. Mr. Gould's presence was not the only factor motivating Mr. Taylor. The AFT negotiations take place in "meet and confer" sessions, which by law are not merely bargaining but approach conditions of collective bargaining whereby a mutual agreement is reached. The effectiveness of this framework is recognized by the University administration, which in its interests, obviously would like to return to the advisory "let's study it some more in every last detail" approach.

The majority of UC's librarians thought they were acting in their own best interests by voting to accept Mr. Taylor's offer. But there is a much greater likelihood that they have unwittingly cooperated with Mr. Taylor's office in a maneuver designed, given its timing, to undermine the growing unity among UC librarians. The invitation to sit on a statewide administrative committee is indeed attractive and unprecedented. Let us hope that the hand of friendship extended now with such exquisite timing will prove itself more trustworthy than long years of bitter experience give us any right to expect.

LAUC appointed Johanna Tallman (UCLA), Gwen Lloyd (UCB) and John Tanno (UCR) to the administrative salary committee. Its first meeting was on October 13th at University Hall in Berkeley.

AFT negotiations are continuing, and at an October 11th meeting, the AFT proposed that the Union and the administration agree upon what salary inequity librarians suffer. When agreement is reached on that point, the AFT proposed that both parties jointly go to the Legislature in an attempt to get increased funding to correct the inequity.

In an October 16 letter to Francis X. Small, Berkeley Campus Personnel Office, the AFT's Sanctionee wrote:

At our meeting on October 11, 1972, I said the AFT would prepare a comparison of librarian salaries with those of other UC academic employees. In the enclosed table I have selected those positions which do not require a doctorate and therefore are most relevant for comparison purposes. Lecturers and instructors are included because many persons in these classifications do not have doctorates. In some instances, the classification title only requires a BA or BS,

although the pay is significantly higher than librarians' pay. This is an example of the inequity of librarians with other academic jobs which demonstrates the sex discrimination factor.

As we have pointed out, librarians are the lowest paid full-time academic employees. The inequity ranges between 16.2 percent for Lecturers to 3.9 percent for Junior Specialist, a beginning research position in which appointees may have a BA or MA. The Continuing Education Specialist I position, which "normally" requires a master's degree, starts 30.4 percent higher, while the Supervisor of Teaching with a master's also is 30.4 percent higher, and the same Supervisor I position with a BA pays 18.1 percent more.

We believe that this information presents another compelling reason why the University should agree to an inequity adjustment to eliminate the historic patterns of sex discrimination which have depressed librarian salaries.

I hope that it will be possible to reach an agreement at our next meeting for an inequity adjustment which takes a meaningful step toward eliminating sex discrimination.

COMPARISON OF LIBRARIAN SALARIES
WITH ACADEMIC SALARIES (NON-FACULTY) NOT REQUIRING DOCTORATE,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JULY 1, 1972

Classification	Monthly Starting Salary (Fiscal Year 11 months except as noted)
Librarians	\$ 690.00
Continuing Educational Specialist I	900.00
Supervisor of Teaching (M.A.)	849.00
Supervisor of Teaching (B.A.)	815.00
*Assistant Supervisor in Physical Education	953.33
Junior Home Economist	816.67
Assistant Home Economist	865.67
Junior Agriculturist	783.33
Assistant Agriculturist	866.67
Junior Specialist	866.67
Assistant Specialist	717.00
Junior Coordinator of Public Programs	852.00
Assistant Coordinator of Public Programs	766.67
Instructor	900.00
Acting Instructor	933.33
Lecturer	886.00
Associate	1,009.00
*Nursery School Teacher	754.00
Teaching Assistant	873.64
Orchestra Assistant	842.00
*Physical Activities Assistant	842.00
Teaching Fellow	842.00
*Research Assistant	1,006.00
Postgraduate Research	770.00
Nursery School Assistant	735.00
	842.00

*50% appointment converted to monthly full-time rate
**Academic year salary converted to fiscal year (11 months)

Berkeley - San Francisco AFT Opposes Obscenity Initiative

The University Federation of Librarians, Local 1795 (Berkeley-San Francisco) passed a resolution against Proposition 18 at its September 26 membership meeting. A Local 1795 member, Laurel Burley, wrote the following letter to other library unions in California on October 4th.

One of the state propositions appearing on the November ballot is of special interest and concern to librarians. This is Prop. 18, the so-called "obscenity" initiative. Prop. 18 is in fact a drastic censorship measure of the type which librarians have been fighting for years. It claims to protect minors from hardcore pornography, but in fact over 80% of its provisions relate to what adults can read or look at. It repeals or changes 2 of the 3 constitutionally required tests for judging obscenity. 1) It repeals from section 311 of the penal code the tests that the material "taken as a whole is utterly without redeeming social importance." 2) It changes the contemporary standards test which the Supreme Court interprets as the state as the community, to wit that the community shall be the incorporated areas in which the activity complained of occurred, or if the area is unincorporated, contemporary standards shall be those prevailing in a 10-mile radius. Thus it would create a vast bureaucratic jungle of censorship laws, varying from city to city. Books and films could not circulate freely throughout the state. Adults in one city could be denied what is allowed in an adjoining city. Prop. 18 is probably unconstitutional in several respects; for example it allows books, films and other matter to be seized without a search warrant.

Librarians know from bitter experience that censorship proposals such as this have been used in the past to hound librarians from their jobs when they attempted to follow the Library Bill of Rights. It is imperative that we work to defeat this initiative, just as California voters defeated the notorious "Clean" amendment in 1963 which Prop. 18 closely parallels. Groups which have already called for its defeat include the California Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO), the Alameda County Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO), the California Library Association, the California Institute of Libraries, and the California Society of Librarians. We would urge you to pass a resolution in your union for defeat of Prop. 18, allowing your name to be used publicly. If you are affiliated with your county central labor council, we urge you to work to have a similar resolution passed there ...

Persons wanting more information about Prop. 18, can contact Laurel Burley, Rhetoric Dept. Library, Dwinelle Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

AFSCME-AFT Library Caucus Formed at Berkeley

The kind of on-the-line camaraderie established between all library employees, professional and non-professional, student and career, during the recent strike on the Berkeley campus has engendered a new alignment of library forces resulting in the formation of an organization entitled the Library Union Caucus (LUC). The University's monolithic and uncompromising response to the basic union demands over working conditions, salary and grievance procedure underscored the need for a forum to allow for cooperation, coordination and consolidation among the librarians in the American Federation of Teachers, Local 1795, and the library assistants, clerks and students in the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 1695. The idea of this type of federation was also deemed important in a University system which considers the library a separate administrative unit with its own budget and unique job classifications. To address successfully such matters as salary inequities, classifications, and the working relationships of all library employees, the LUC was formed.

One of the organization's major and immediate goals is the formulation of a program around which all library employees can unite, but its first concern was protecting returning strikers from administrative discrimination and supervisory harassment. The response was immediate and determined: striking library employees were not returning to work hat in hand, nor were they going to allow themselves to be harassed once back. This simple, basic right soon burgeoned into a list that now includes demands for inequity salary adjustments, a cessation of exploitation of student employees, a meaningful affirmative action program for minorities, the appointment of a task force to deal with the underclassification of library assistants and more administrative responsiveness, both to user needs and staff aspirations and needs. LUC representatives have already raised these and other issues with the new University Librarian, Richard Dougherty.

The LUC has also asked for the joint participation of both unions in the handling of library grievances. Since the formation of the Caucus, librarians have participated in several non-professional grievances, all of which were successfully concluded. In the past, non-

professional grievances had been handled by the more centralized campus-wide AFSCME grievance committee, in the future, these grievances will be dealt with by AFSCME library shop stewards and librarians responsible to the LUC. Further consolidation is envisioned.

The Caucus publishes a monthly newsletter designed to deal with items of concern not only to UC Berkeley library employees, but to library employees wherever they work. The issues raised in the newsletter are often discussed in the monthly Caucus meetings. Responses and comments from union and non-union members are printed in the newsletter. Distribution is planned to all UCB library employees, all University of California libraries, and other selected libraries. A mailing list is being established and individuals wishing to receive the Library Union Caucus Newsletter can write to:

Library Union Caucus
c/o American Federation of Teachers
2510 Channing Way
Berkeley, California 94704

The Library Union Caucus meets the last Sunday of each month at 7:30 pm, the exact date and place to be announced in the issue of the Newsletter preceding the meeting. All library staff members are invited to attend.

This article is by Larry Oberg, Education-Psychology Library, Berkeley. It was reprinted from the Library Union Caucus Newsletter, August 1972 issue.

American Federation of Teachers Workshop

Librarians from seven University of California campuses took part in a workshop September 16 on "Librarians and Collective Bargaining", which was highlighted by news of recent salary talks between American Federation of Teachers librarians and University top management. (For information on these talks, see separate story in this issue.)

The workshop was one of six held in UCLA's Hedrick Hall during a conference on The University of California in the 70's, which was sponsored by the University Council - AFT. More than fifty faculty members and librarians attended. The UCLA Faculty Union was host.

Anne Lipow, of UC Berkeley, chaired the librarians' group. The discussion was led by panel members Martin Silver, of UC Santa Barbara, and Patrick Coyle, of UC Irvine.

Much of the discussion at the workshop centered around the question of LAUC's participation in the statewide administrative salary committee. Most participants viewed this invitation from Angus Taylor as yet another effort to divide librarians on an important issue so that one group could be pitted against the other. They summed it up as follows: (1) the salary question does not require further study; (2) LAUC, as a professional organization, has already given full and complete recommendations on salary. These obviate further "study"; (3) if the Ad Hoc Committee is a veiled form of salary negotiation, it would be inappropriate for LAUC to take part since it is a professional organization, not a voluntary employee organization.

This discussion led to a proposal by Don Skippers, of UC Santa Barbara, that LAUC form an official liaison committee with AFT to study ways the two groups could work together on issues of common interest. This met with general approval and was taken under advisement by John Tanno, LAUC Vice President from UCR.

Panel members Silver and Coyle then outlined several ideas on LAUC-AFT cooperation. The gist of their remarks was that there is no territorial dispute between the two groups; that their functions were really complementary in that the natural role of the AFT, as a voluntary organization, is to represent librarians in collective bargaining in matters of wages, hours and working conditions whereas that of LAUC, as an official UC organization, is to define and safeguard professional standards for librarians and to continue with the para-administrative tasks it presently performs for the University.

A crucial nexus between the two groups would be that librarians through AFT negotiate the rights and duties of LAUC and that they be spelled out in the collective bargaining contract.

Other librarians attending the workshop included George Hill, Michael MacInnes and Margaret Cressaty of Irvine; Laura Nanna of Santa Barbara; Margo Sasse of San Diego; Molly Reeves and Liz Ingalls of Davis; Marsha Berman, Larry Lauerhass and Dino Sanchez of UCLA; and Judy Hyde of the UCLA Library School.

AFT - LAUC VICTORY: UC Riverside Abandons Attempt to Put Librarian II's on Probation

In July of this year the library administration at the Riverside campus of the University of California announced the conversion to the new three rank system. Only those librarians who were Librarian III's or above, or had been on the staff for at least six years, would be granted "career" status. It had been commonly understood up to that time that librarians were considered to be permanent employees when they had reached the rank of Librarian II. The newly implemented Section 82 had left the granting of career status for those below the rank of Librarian III up to local campus option, but only Riverside had moved to deny this status to previously permanent Librarian II's.

On August 18, Sam Bottone, Executive Secretary of the UC-AFT sent a letter to President Charles Hitch, in which he stated:

It has come to our attention that the University has not carried out the promises of fair and equitable treatment in which the rights and interests of presently employed librarians would be protected. On several campuses, notably Riverside, librarians who have successfully completed their probationary period of employment were given potential career status. That is, they were reduced in status to probationary employees. This action constitutes a violation of the rights and interests of these librarians. The University Council demands that the University immediately restore all librarians who successfully completed their probationary period of one year as of June 30, 1972 to career status. We demand, further, that this corrective action be taken without delay, and that all librarians be "grandfathered" in an equitable and uniform way.

LAUC made a separate protest along the same lines. Shortly thereafter, the administration at Riverside did an about-face and granted career status to those Librarian II's who had previously been denied it.

California Labor Votes Affirmative Action for Women

The following resolutions supporting affirmative action for women were passed at the August 1972 Ninth Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, in Los Angeles. AFT delegates were prominent in supporting them:

RESOLUTION NO. 30 Affirmative Action Program

RESOLVED, That the Ninth Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, encourage local unions to set up Affirmative Action Committees to develop Affirmative Action Programs to encourage employers through collective bargaining to achieve the following:

- a. An active effort is made to hire women in job categories where more should obviously be included.
- b. Recruitment sources and procedures are spelled out for recruiting a pool of candidates including qualified women for specific job categories.
- c. Promotion procedures are spelled out so that every employee is evaluated and encouraged to apply for openings regardless of present employment in traditional jobs lacking obvious promotional possibilities.

d. Where women are already assuming responsibilities over and above those described in their job classification, such classification be revised to reflect more adequately the actual job being done and compensation it calls for.

RESOLUTION NO. 32 End Discrimination Against Women Workers

RESOLVED, That the Ninth Convention of the California Labor Federation AFL-CIO urge its affiliates when negotiating with employers to:

1. Evaluate all jobs as work with a rate of pay based on job content skill and responsibility regardless of the sex of the worker doing the task.

2. Demand that promotions be granted on the basis of competence and qualifications and usual seniority rights.

3. Eliminate variations in job descriptions which serve as a pretext for nullifying the Equal Pay for Equal Work laws.

4. Extend all contract rules and regulations heretofore applicable only to women and minors to the entire work force.

5. Include hospitalization costs incurred for reasons of pregnancy in health and welfare plans.

6. Provide day care facilities for children of employed parents.

After discussion and debate on the floor on the Convention, the following resolution was passed over the vote to table ("file") of the Committee on Resolutions. It received a large majority vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 110 Call Convention of Trade Union Women

WHEREAS, Women make up 53% of the nation's total population and 38% of its work force, yet the discriminatory treatment women suffer in nearly every section of our national life shames a society which declares its adherence to the principle of equal opportunity; and

WHEREAS, Nowhere is sex discrimination more flagrantly practiced than in the workplace where women earn on the average, only \$3 for every \$5 earned by similarly employed men --

where discriminatory recruitment, job placement, on-the-job training and promotion policies keep millions of women in low-skilled and low paid jobs -- where many women are penalized for childbearing by loss of job or seniority rights; and

WHEREAS, the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, is committed to combating discrimination because of race, creed or color, and is now in a position to play a major role in combating discrimination against women wherever it exists; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, call a statewide week-end conference of trade union women in conjunction with the State Legislative Conference in 1973 to develop a program to remedy the aforementioned problems.

The above action proposal would help implement generally favorable CLF resolutions. According to some of its proponents the desire is not to deny attendance at such a conference by sympathetic men, but rather to assure leadership by union women, who are most familiar with the problem and most determined to secure action to relieve it.

Resolutions 30 and 32 were presented by the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor; Resolution 110 by the Office and Professional Employees Local 29, Oakland.

The *Librarians' Advocate* is published quarterly by the University Council - AFT, 2510 Channing Way, Berkeley, CA 94704. It is distributed free to all UC librarians, and is available to others for a contribution of \$2.00 (pre-paid) for 4 quarterly issues. *CU Voice*, speaking for the Berkeley Librarians' union, ceased publication (with no. 3, June 1970) in order to make way for the *Librarians' Advocate*, the voice of librarians on all 9 campuses of the University of California.

President: Paul Goodman, Professor of History, Davis
Executive Secretary: Sam Bottone, University Council Office

opeu:29
afl-cio

Continued from page 1

On the Berkeley campus, the library administration set up administrative committees to deal with collection development and other problems. These committees paralleled already existing LAUC committees, and by their very existence, took away from the LAUC committees much of the influence and voice they might have had in policy formation. All the important input on selection was being generated by the administrative Selection Committee, while the LAUC Collection Development Committee was left to perform non-decision making functions, such as collecting selection statements from various library units. Finally, LAUC-Berkeley dissolved its committees because they were left with almost no role in the library.

A salary inequity adjustment for librarians was implemented by the President's Office with no consultation with LAUC.

Genuine staff participation in decision making through LAUC requires more than empty assurances from the Vice President for Academic Affairs that he is interested in librarians' views, and more than token consultation with a few LAUC leaders: Yet that is what happens repeatedly while real decisions are being made by administrators, often in conjunction with others outside the University. The present University administration views LAUC not as a partner, but as a transmission belt; an instrument that it attempts to manipulate in order to impose on librarians policies and decisions that would not survive critical review by LAUC members. Librarians' lack of authority is not likely to be reversed unless they develop their own, autonomous sources of counter-pressure to insure that they not only have a voice in decision making, but that their voice is more than sounds blowing in the wind. The most practical way that can happen is through collective bargaining.

In 1967 courageous UC librarians challenged an arbitrary administration by setting up the Librarians Association of the University of California. Nominally recognized as a part of the University by the administration, it must receive its authority from the administration. In spite of its limited role, LAUC has served the University and its librarians well. But in times of crisis, of government and media-generated hostility to the University, of budgetary stringencies and administrative indifference, its inherent weaknesses have stood out sharply.

Though on some campuses LAUC has the cooperation of the University Librarian on library policy and personnel questions, it can only recommend. Its effectiveness as an instrument for setting library and personnel policy depends on the willingness of the Re-

gents and administration to consult in advance and to heed the Librarians Association's advice. In recent months we have witnessed a clear tendency to bypass and ignore LAUC on a matter of vital concern to librarians. Collective bargaining, as conceived by the American Federation of Teachers, will change that.

On its own, LAUC cannot remedy its defects, for in its present position it lacks the power. Nor would it be appropriate for LAUC to transform itself into a bargaining agent, for as an isolated, small organization, without the powerful allies necessary to bargain successfully in the public sector, a LAUC-sponsored bargaining agency would find itself unable to represent librarians effectively. That is the job of a union, with allies in the AFT faculty and other classes of academic employees at UC, in the labor movement, and in the political arena.

The AFT seeks a collective bargaining agreement with the Regents that will strengthen LAUC. Through a negotiated contract, AFT seeks to make the Librarians Association a contractually authorized body.

GENUINE ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Through collective bargaining, AFT will aim to give LAUC power to formulate and implement library and personnel policies and practices. AFT seeks a legally binding agreement in which the Regents accept the following principles:

PERSONNEL POLICY. The Regents, acting through the President and the Chancellors, shall accept as binding the professional judgement of librarians, expressed through their formal LAUC bodies, in all cases involving appointments, promotion and merit increases. In those cases where there is disagreement between the librarian being reviewed and the LAUC committee recommendation, an outside Review Committee drawn from librarians on other campuses and jointly selected by the grievant and the LAUC committee shall decide. Existing Regental policy prohibiting application of political tests in personnel actions shall be legally binding on the Regents.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE. The AFT would like to have a permanent LAUC Appeals Committee on each campus. The decisions rendered by these committees would be binding on the administration as well as the grievant. An alternative procedure, namely modifying the present academic non-Senate grievance procedure so that the decision of an outside arbitrator is binding on the University, should also be available. It should also be possible to bring class action complaints to resolution through this procedure.

LIBRARY POLICY. All library policies and procedures should require approval by LAUC. The Librarians Association, in consultation with faculty and students, should be the main force in establishing new library programs, eliminating others, and in making modifications. The right of individual librarians, such as subject and form specialists, to act as independent professionals must be protected.

In these ways and others, collective bargaining will transform the Librarians Association into a powerful decision-making body whose authority will not wax or wane according to the whim of administrators. At the same time that the AFT, through agreements negotiated with the Regents, strengthens LAUC, it will advance the interests of librarians in those areas where LAUC is not an appropriate mechanism. Thus the Union will negotiate salaries and fringe benefits, it will limit the right of the Regents arbitrarily to increase workload or set arbitrary constraints on library development. It will negotiate with the Regents to provide appropriate support for librarians, as well as other matters outside the purview of LAUC, matters to be determined democratically by the membership of the Union. Through common membership in the AFT, librarians will have a useful forum to educate faculty and other academic employees in the problems facing libraries and librarians.

PUBLIC SECTOR BARGAINING

Many librarians and other members of the academic staff recognize the need for collective bargaining, yet they wonder how it can work in an institution such as UC where the Regents themselves have only limited control over purse-strings. Moreover, people ask, given the divided nature of authority between Regents, the Governor and the Legislature, with whom would the Union negotiate?

FIRST, the Regents are a legally authorized body, with which librarians through the Union would seek to reach agreement, very much as other unions make agreements with business corporations whose boards of directors assent to contracts negotiated by their management and representatives. At UC, the administration, representing the Regents, probably would conduct the actual negotiations. Already, the University is preparing for collective bargaining by hiring experienced labor relations staff to assist the administration in negotiations.

SECOND, in all non-economic questions, such as accepting personnel decisions made by LAUC, the Regents have full authority to negotiate since these matters are exclusively within their jurisdiction at present.

THIRD, on money questions, the Regents would reach an agreement with the AFT which the Legislature would then have to fund. Within the next few years, the California Legislature, under pressure from organized labor, will pass legislation granting to public employees the right to engage in collective bargaining. This has happened in other major urbanized states already and California will soon fall into line. When it does, the state will be saying that if public employees elect collective bargaining, that will be the method for determining wages, hours, working conditions and other bargainable matters affecting public employees, including University staff. Experience elsewhere indicates that when collective bargaining for public employees has been accepted, legislative bodies meet their responsibilities to fund settlements.

There are no guarantees that settlements will be fully funded. For that reason, the academic staff must have influential allies in Sacramento, and they can only expect to have such a voice by becoming a part of the 1.6 million-member California labor movement. As members of the American Federation of Teachers, UC librarians will have powerful allies in Sacramento and in California politics.

At stake here are not only the interests of librarians, but also the welfare of students, faculty and other library patrons. Through the AFT and a strengthened LAUC, librarians can become an effective political and economic force that will reverse the trend towards an erosion in the quality of UC's libraries. LAUC and the AFT will have to undertake surveys and in other ways measure how well UC libraries are serving their clientele, and where service needs improvement, they must take corrective measures.

The AFT knows that only by demonstrating its commitment to serve the educational needs of all the people of California can UC be preserved as the country's leading public university.

*Editor's Note: This is a provisional statement concerning the present and future roles of LAUC and the AFT. We welcome your comments. LAUC-AFT relations will be discussed at an October 20th AFT Conference in Berkeley (see this month's *University Guardian* for details) and at the November LAUC Assembly meeting in Davis.*

RECEIVED

FEB 27 1973

GIFTS & EXCHANGES

10

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I wish to join the American Federation of Teachers, and I agree to pay monthly dues as follows:

Assistant Professor — \$ 6.00	Assistant Librarian — \$4.00
Associate Professor — \$ 8.00	Associate Librarian — \$6.00
Professor — \$12.00	Librarian — \$9.00

Dues for other classifications are comparable to those paid by the professional rank with a minimum of \$5.00 a month for those, including part-time faculty, who are paid less than assistant professors (\$11,200 per year).

Name _____ Soc. Sec. # _____

Home Address _____

Campus _____ Department _____

Classification _____ Full Time _____ Part Time _____

Signature _____ Date _____

NOTE: At Berkeley and San Francisco, the dues for Librarians is \$6.00 per month.

597
020
1/21
JAN

University Council — AFT
2510 Channing Way
Berkeley, California 94704